

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

AMIRESSSE DESJARDINS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	NO. 3:24-cv-00843
)	
WALMART STORES, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER


Plaintiff Amiresse Desjardins, a Tennessee resident proceeding pro se, filed a Complaint against Walmart Stores and related individuals and entities, for violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Doc. No. 1). On July 29, 2024, the Court granted Plaintiff permission to proceed as a pauper, conducted a preliminary review of the Complaint, and found that Plaintiff had failed to plead sufficient factual allegations to meet the standard of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (Doc. No. 5). The Court allowed Plaintiff an opportunity to cure this defect by filing an Amended Complaint on a form to be provided by the Clerk of Court, and directed that the Amended Complaint be filed within 30 days. (Id. at 3–4). The Court cautioned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the Court’s Order in a timely fashion may result in the dismissal of this case for want of prosecution. (Id. at 4).

There is a notation to the docket of this case reflecting the fact that, on September 19, 2024, the Clerk’s Office received a call from Plaintiff, as a result of which her address of record was corrected and a copy of the Court’s July 29 Order (along with a form for filing an Amended Complaint) was reissued to her corrected address.

As of today's date, which is more than 30 days after the reissuance of the Court's prior Order, Plaintiff has failed to file an Amended Complaint as directed or to seek an extension of her filing deadline. She has thus failed to prosecute her case. Dismissal of this action is therefore appropriate, pursuant to the Court's "well settled . . . authority to dismiss sua sponte a lawsuit for failure to prosecute." Carpenter v. City of Flint, 723 F.3d 700, 704 (6th Cir. 2013). Due to Plaintiff's pro se status and the preference for disposing of cases on their merits, see Mulbah v. Detroit Bd. of Educ., 261 F.3d 586, 591 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting Little v. Yeutter, 984 F.2d 160, 162 (6th Cir. 1993)), the dismissal will be without prejudice.

Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of prosecution. The Clerk shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



WAVERLY D. ORENSHAW, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE